

**REMARKS**

The present invention is directed to an interlayer for a laminate glass which comprises a thermoplastic resin sheet provided with embossments comprising concave portions and convex portions on both sides thereof.

In the Office Action dated May 18, 2005, the Abstract was objected to. Claims 6, 7 and 9 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,863,956. Furthermore, Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by either Lloyd et al (U.S. Pat. No. 4,135,023) or Hoagland et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,455,103). Lastly, Claims 7 and 9 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In the present Amendment, the Abstract has been rewritten in one paragraph. In addition, claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 9 is dependent on claim 7. Claims 6, 13-15 and 25-17 have been canceled. Claims 1-5, 8, 10-12, 16-24 and 28-36 were previously canceled. Claims 37-39 have been added. Claims 37 and 38 are supported by the specification, for example, at page 21, lines 7-9. Claim 39 is supported by the specification, for example, at page 22, lines 5-13. No new matter has been added and entry of these amendments is respectfully submitted to be proper. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 7, 9 and 37-39 will be all the claims pending in the application.

**1. Drawings**

The Examiner has not yet confirmed that the drawings filed with the application on February 26, 2004 have been accepted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate such acceptance in the next PTO communication.

**2. Response to Objection to Abstract**

The Abstract was objected to for containing more than one paragraph.

As described above, Applicants have rewritten the Abstract in one paragraph. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the Abstract.

**3. Response to Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 6, 7 and 9 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,863,956.

In response, Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 7 and 9. Claim 6 has been canceled.

**4. Response to 102(b) Rejection of Claim 6**

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by either Lloyd et al (U.S. Pat. No. 4,135,023) or Hoagland et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,455,103).

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot, because claim 6 has been canceled.

**5. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants respectfully submit that present claims 7 and 9 are in condition for allowance.

As described above, Applicants have rewritten claim 7, from which claim 9 depends, to be in independent form.

In addition, Applicants submit that new claims 37-39 are allowable, *inter alia*, for the reason that they depend from allowable claim 7.

**6. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of claims 7, 9 and 37-39 are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby earnestly solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Fang Liu  
Registration No. 51,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 10, 2005